

Azevedo, George

From: Bauer, Candice
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2017 1:31 PM
To: Azevedo, George
Subject: FW: draft watershed review matrix

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Chief, Section 2
NPDES Branch, EPA Region 5, WN-15J
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106, Fax: 312-697-2668

From: Blasing, Nicole (MPCA) [mailto:nicole.blasing@state.mn.us]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 8:57 AM
To: Bauer, Candice <bauer.candice@epa.gov>; Weiss, Steven (MPCA) <steven.weiss@state.mn.us>
Cc: Ireland, Scott <ireland.scott@epa.gov>; Prichard, Gary <prichard.gary@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: draft watershed review matrix

Candice,

Thank you for providing the information below. As Steve indicated I have been working on drafting a framework for the nonpoint source factsheet. We are planning on providing EPA with a copy of the nonpoint source factsheet by the end of next week. It will be good to have some discussion on it at our upcoming meeting on Monday April 17th.

Thank you,

Nicole Blasing, Supervisor
North Central Regional Unit
Municipal Wastewater Section
Ph. 218-316-3890

Our mission is to protect and improve the environment and enhance human health.

From: Bauer, Candice [mailto:bauer.candice@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 8:51 AM
To: Weiss, Steven (MPCA) <steven.weiss@state.mn.us>
Cc: Blasing, Nicole (MPCA) <nicole.blasing@state.mn.us>; Ireland, Scott <ireland.scott@epa.gov>; Prichard, Gary <prichard.gary@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: draft watershed review matrix

Thanks Steve.

Here are our initial thoughts on the fact sheet info we would ideally like to see for permits. Obviously, let's talk through this on Monday as we see this as a starting point for discussion. Let me know if you want me to forward it to others at MPCA.

Candice

Outline of Fact Sheet for permits where TP limits are based on future nonpoint source reductions being achieved in the watershed

Where TP limits or decisions to not include TP limits are based in part on assumptions (reflected either in modeling assumptions or assumptions about ambient water quality) that phosphorus reductions will occur in the watershed through nonpoint source controls, EPA would like to see the following included in the fact sheet for each permit in that watershed:

- A description of each project or program being implemented in the watershed.
- For each project, provide the following
 - Schedule for project implementation (major milestones)
 - Estimated costs and sources of funding
 - Expected outcome (i.e. mass of TP prevented from entering the surface waters compared to current conditions)
 - Timeline for when improvements should be able to be observed in the watershed and where
 - Specific locations within the watershed where the projects or programs will occur/apply
 - Accountability
 - Reporting of progress
 - Monitoring/verification of results (how, when, and where will progress be determined, will this be through modelling and/or monitoring)
 - Schedule for the next round of ambient MPCA monitoring or watershed monitoring plans (that would show the results of NPS reductions in the watershed)

To the extent that other documents contain such information, that information can be referenced so long as specific projects/programs to be implemented in the receiving water are cited (i.e., includes specific section or page citations).

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Chief, Section 2
NPDES Branch, EPA Region 5, WN-15J
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106, Fax: 312-697-2668

From: Weiss, Steven (MPCA) [<mailto:steven.weiss@state.mn.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 8:14 AM
To: Bauer, Candice <bauer.candice@epa.gov>
Cc: Blasing, Nicole (MPCA) <nicole.blasing@state.mn.us>
Subject: RE: draft watershed review matrix

Candice,

We will start 1) collecting watershed review examples along with 2) names of permits you have reviewed.

As for nonpoint/factsheet examples, Nicole (cc'd) has been leading that effort and could provide some examples when they are ready for review. I think she has been able to find some good material that, to my recollection, seems to fit what we had discussed at our meeting.

Steve

From: Bauer, Candice [<mailto:bauer.candice@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 5:08 PM
To: Weiss, Steven (MPCA) <steven.weiss@state.mn.us>
Subject: RE: draft watershed review matrix

Thanks so much Steve for sending the spreadsheet along!

We got a chance to look at this today. You provided example memos for us that describe the scenario, which was very helpful. I believe we have several of these already... South Fork Crow (Delano), Chippewa and Minnesota Rivers (Starbuck), and Buffalo River (Hawley). However, for the other scenarios, we were hoping that you could either (1) send those memos to us to start looking at, or (2) remind us which permit the memo is related to if you have already sent it (so that we can find it more easily in our permit files and refresh our memories on this).

Also, I hope that we can get you all our thoughts on what types of information we are hoping to get on the nonpoint source plans for the watershed and some additional thoughts on the scenarios either tomorrow or Thursday.

Thanks again! I am looking forward to talking more on Monday as well!

Candice

Candice R. Bauer, Ph.D.
Chief, Section 2
NPDES Branch, EPA Region 5, WN-15J
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604
Office Phone: 312-353-2106, Fax: 312-697-2668

From: Weiss, Steven (MPCA) [<mailto:steven.weiss@state.mn.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 9:31 AM
To: Bauer, Candice <bauer.candice@epa.gov>
Subject: draft watershed review matrix

Candice, see the attached draft watershed phosphorus effluent limit review matrix.

Steven Weiss
Supervisor | Effluent Limits Unit
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
651 757 2814

